



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/291,147	04/15/1999	ADRIAN STORISTEANU	CA9-98-011	1732

21254 7590 08/01/2002

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

GOODFRIEND, JASON H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/291,147	Applicant(s) STORISTEANU ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason H Goodfriend	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09-10-1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____    | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 17-20 are independent claims.

### REJECTIONS

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 6, 7, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

**With regard to dependent Claims 6 and 7,** it is unclear as to which linking “said linking means” and “means for linking” respectively refers to. These claims are dependent on Claim 2, which discloses the linking performed by the command interface module. However, these Claims are also dependent on Claim 1 which discloses the linking performed by the mark control module.

**With regard to dependent Claim 16,** Claim 16 recites the limitation “said activemark” in lines 1-2 of the Claim. Claim 16 is dependent on independent Claim 13, and the word “activemark” does not appear in Claim 13. However, the word “mark” does appear in Claim 13. The examiner has made the assumption that the terms “mark” and “activemark” are synonymous.

**With regard to independent Claims 17-20,** the applicants are claiming a data storage medium in accordance with Claims 13, 14, 15, and 16 respectively. As they have not specified how Claims 17-20 are in accordance with Claims 13, 14, 15, and 16

Art Unit: 2176

respectively, the applicants have not established the metes and bounds of Claims 17-20.

Additionally, Claim 20 fully incorporates the deficiency of Claim 16.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. **Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Camarda (Bill Camarda, Using Microsoft Word 97, Que Corporation, pp 27, 203-215, and 521-530, 1997).**

With regard to independent Claim 1, Camarda teaches on page 27 that Microsoft Word 97 is a processing system for processing a document since it provides the means to “create, open, edit, and save Word documents”. Camarda teaches features of Microsoft Word 97 that constitute a programmable text processing module, a parsing editor, a mark control module, a graphical user interface (GUI) module, and an edit control module, in multiple places in his book.

For example, Camarda teaches the features of AutoText on pages 203-215. Figure 7.7 on page 206 describes an edit control module for inserting AutoText entries (which are examples of marks). The AutoText Toolbar displayed in Figure 7.7 constitutes a GUI interface that provides a means for controlling the display of the document. This toolbar can be used to create, modify, and clear the marks created by this feature. Since, the AutoText Toolbar allows the user to modify aspects of AutoText

entries, it constitutes an edit control module. The GUI module can be controlled via the AutoText button, which is discussed on page 206. Indeed, it is stated that “The AutoText button, which displays the AutoText dialog box, where you can control all aspects of your collection of AutoText entries”. As the user is parsing the Word document, he/she can update the marks via the AUTOTEXTLIST fields described on page 213. These fields are the means of linking the AutoText commands with portions of text.

Another feature taught by Camarda that anticipates this Claim is the Hyperlinking feature of Microsoft Word, which is taught on pages 521-530. This feature allows the user to place marks in the document edit them via a GUI. Part of the GUI is displayed in Figure 18.23 on page 526. Placing these activemarks in the document allows the user not only to access Web pages, but also to access other programs. As the document is parsed, these links can be entered. Figure 18.24 on page 528 displays the linking of portions of the text with commands

**With regard to independent Claim 8**, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the “means for binding” in the present claim is functionally equivalent to the “linking” of Claim 1. Therefore, the rationale used in the rejection of Claim 1 also applies to the present Claim.

**With regard to independent Claim 13 and independent Claim 17**, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the “activating said mark in response to an activation input” is inherent in Camarda’s teaching. Marks are put in the document so that they may be activated. Therefore, the rationale used in the rejection of Claim 1 also applies to the present Claims.

**With regard to dependent Claims 2, 14, and 15, and independent Claims 18 and 19**, the command interface module of the Hyperlinking feature is displayed in Figure 18.20 on page 523 of Camarda. Camarda teaches on page 521 that the Hyperlinks can be used to link to other locations within a given Word file (internal) as well as link to external commands such as accessing an Excel worksheet.

**With regard to dependent Claim 3**, Figure 7.4 on page 205 of Camarda displays the GUI for activating the AutoText commands that are linked to portions of the Word document text.

**With regard to dependent Claim 5**, the synchronization between the AutoText marks and the edited text is demonstrated by Camarda on page 213 in which the method of the automatic update of AutoText entries is taught.

**With regard to dependent Claim 6**, Camarda teaches the linking of Hyperlinks to an external Excel program on pages 525-526. Figure 18.23 on page 526 displays the GUI for doing this.

**With regard to dependent Claim 7**, the linking of Hyperlinks to an external Excel program that was discussed in the rejection of Claim 6 links pieces of text to the Hyperlink editor. Furthermore, such linking is unspecified in Word, since the called program from the Hyperlink mark is Excel, and a Word document is not generally linked to Excel. The linked piece of text is linked to an external Excel command.

**With regard to dependent Claim 9**, Camarda teaches on page 209 that AutoText can be used to work with different templates. Thus, it can be used to change the

Art Unit: 2176

appearance of selected portions of the document that are linked to the marks when these marks are activated.

**With regard to dependent Claims 10-11**, Figure 7.4 on page 205 of Camarda demonstrates displaying in an edit view the activemark according to type of activemark. In this case, the type of activemark is the AutoText mark.

**With regard to dependent Claim 12**, the limitation of setting an activemark to a piece of text by a parsing editor is implied by Claim 1 in the expression (of Claim 1) “said linking means being responsive to the operation of said parsing editor”. It has already been demonstrated that Camarda’s teaching of Microsoft Word’s Hyperlink feature contains this limitation.

The present claim’s limitation of an external command (running in the edit system) setting an active mark to a piece of text is contained in Claim 2. It has already been demonstrated that Hyperlink teaches this limitation.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 4, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over by Camarda (Bill Camarda, Using Microsoft Word 97, Que Corporation, pp 232-253, 1997).**

**With regard to dependent Claims 4 and 16 and independent 20, Camarda** does not explicitly teach the ability to change the appearance of the activemark. However, the use of tables (pages 232-253) can be regarded as activemarks in the text. Furthermore, the editing of the appearance of the table cells upon table entry is described on pages 241-242. In a similar manner, it would have been a simple matter and perhaps advantageous to have the ability to modify the appearance of the Hyperlink and AutoText marks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make these modifications.

8. The prior art made record of and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rivette et al, (US 6,389,434 filed 04/09/1998) teaches the linking of applications with data objects via annotations.

Horowitz et al (US 6,122,647 filed 05/19/1998) teaches contextual hypertext links that dynamically source documents with target documents.

Nishimura (US 5,671,427 filed 10/06/1995) teaches a document linking processes for performing a linking process for the marked combination to link the designated sentence in the source document with the designated portion in an editing document.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason H. Goodfriend whose telephone number is (703) 305-4872. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.




Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist who telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JHG

July 26, 2002

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100